arXiv:1608.00481v1 [stat.CO] 1 Aug 2016

Robust split-plot designs for model misspecification

Chang-Yun Lin

Department of Applied Mathematics and Institute of Statistics,

National Chung Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan, 40227

Abstract

Many existing methods for constructing optimal split-plot designs, such as D-optimal designs, only focus on minimizing the variances and covariances of the estimation for the fitted model. However, the underlying true model is usually complicated and unknown and the fitted model is often misspecified. If there exist significant effects that are not included in the model, then the estimation could be highly biased. Therefore, a good split-plot designs should be able to simultaneously control the variances/covariances and the bias of the estimation. In this paper, we propose a new method for constructing optimal split-plot designs that are robust for model misspecification. We provide a general form of the loss function used for the D-optimal minimax criterion and apply it to searching for robust split-plot designs. To more efficiently construct designs, we develop an algorithm which combines the anneal algorithm and point-exchange algorithm. We modify the update formulas for calculating the determinant and inverse of the updated matrix and apply them to increasing the computing speed for our developed program.

Key Words: Anneal algorithm; D-efficiency; D-optimal minimax criterion; Generalized least squares; Loss function; Mean square error; Point-exchange algorithm; Update formulas.

1 Introduction

In experimental designs, the completely randomization is usually recommended to avoid the bias caused by the factors that are not controlled. However, in many industrial or agricultural experiments, there often exist factors whose levels are difficult to change. These factors are called the whole-plot factors. The other factors whose levels are easy to change are called the subplot factors. If whole-plot factors exist in an experiment and the completely randomization is conducted, then the experimental cost will increase due to frequently changing levels of the whole-plot factors. To reduce the cost, the two-stage randomization strategy is usually suggested. First the randomization is conducted only for the treatments of whole-plot factors, call the whole plots. Then in each whole plot, the second randomization is conducted for the treatments of subplot factors, called the subplots. This kind of experiments was first introduced by Fisher (1925) and the design used for the experiment is referred to as the split-plot design (SPD).

The two-stage randomization results in the multistratum structure of the split-plot design and leads to two error terms, the whole-plot errors and the subplot errors. Therefore, traditional analysis methods for completely randomized designs are no longer appropriate and the optimal completely randomized designs may not be optimal for the split-plot experiment. In literature, many approaches for constructing optimal split-plot designs have been proposed. A common construction method is based on the minimum aberration criterion, which can be found in Huang et al. (1998), Binham and Sitter (1999a, 1999b, 2001, 2003), Mukerjee and Fang (2002), and Tichon et al. (2012). The minimum aberration criterion aims to find the optimal design which minimizes the alias of the important effects. An idea of this method is that the powers to detect significant effects are not the same for whole-plot factors and subplot factors. It is usually assumed that the subplot variability is smaller than the whole-plot variability, which implies that the power to detect significant subplot effects is greater than the power to detect significant whole-plot effects. Hence, subplot factors are considered more important and should be given shorter world length than whole-plot factors. The

design that sequentially minimizes the wordlength patterns is selected as the minimum aberration split-plot design. Since the minimum aberration criterion minimizes the alias, the optimal split-plot design constructed by this criterion should have less bias of the estimation for the important effects.

Another widely used criterion for constructing optimal split-plot designs is the D-optimal criterion, which can be found in Lesinger et al. (1996), Goos and Vandebroek (2001, 2003, 2004) and Jones and Goos (2007). The basic idea of this construction method is that a good split-plot design should have higher estimation ability for the fitted model. This estimation ability can be evaluated by measuring the determinant of the information matrix of a design, called the D-efficiency. The D-optimal split-plot design is the one which has the highest D-efficiency among all of designs. Since maximizing the D-efficiency of a design is equivalent to minimizing the determinant of the variance-covariant matrix of the estimation, the D-optimal split-plot design should have smaller variances and covariances for the estimation of the effects. A good review of split-plot designs can be found in Jones and Nachtsheim (2009).

Although the minimum aberration criterion and the D-optimal criterion are commonly used for constructing optimal split-plot designs, the optimal designs selected by the two criteria may have higher mean square error (MSE), which consists of the square of the bias matrix and the variance-covariance matrix of the estimation. The minimum aberration criterion focuses on minimizing the bias of the estimation but less considers minimizing the variances and covariances. Therefore, the optimal split-plot design constructed by this criterion may have higher mean square error due to higher variances or covariances of the estimation. On the contrary, the D-optimal criterion aims to minimize the variances and covariances but ignores the bias of the estimation. When the fitted model is misspecified, there exists a bias for the estimation. Therefore, the optimal split-plot design constructed by the D-optimal criterion may have higher mean square error due to higher bias of the estimation.

In this paper, we take the model misspecification into account. When the fitted model differs from the underlying true model, a good split-plot design should be able to simultaneously control the

variance-covariance matrix and the bias matrix of the estimation. An appropriate criterion to deal with the model misspecification is the D-optimal minimax criterion proposed by Zhou (2001, 2008), Wilmut and Zhou (2011), Lin and Zhou (2013) and Yin and Zhou (2014). This criterion is usually applied on the construction of the robust completely randomized design for model misspecification. In this paper, we extend the application of the D-optimal minimax criterion to the split-plot designs and provide a general form of the loss function used by this criterion. This general form of the loss function allows us apply the D-optimal minimax criterion to selecting optimal design for split-plot experiments or completely randomized experiments with or without model misspecification. To more efficiently construct and search for the robust split-plot design, we combine the point-exchange algorithm proposed by Goos and Vandebroek (2001) and the anneal algorithm proposed by Zhou (2001). The update formulas suggested by Arnouts and Goos (2010) are applied to increasing the computing speed for calculating the loss function for the D-optimal minimax criterion.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the split-plot design and the D-optimal minimax criterion with the general form of the loss function, which can be used for selecting robust split-plot designs or completely randomized designs. Section 3 provides an algorithm which combines the point-exchange algorithm and the anneal algorithm for constructing and selecting the robust split-plot design for model misspecification. The update formulas are introduced and modified for the D-optimal minimax criterion. Section 4 provides two examples to demonstrate how to apply our proposed method to obtaining robust split-plot designs. Section 5 is the conclusions and remarks.

2 Background and criterion

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote an N-run full factorial design for factors $F_1, \cdots, F_m$ with levels $s_1, \cdots, s_m$, respectively, where $N = \prod_{i=1}^{m} s_i$ and the levels of factors are coded as orthogonal contrasts. Let $\mathbf{H}$ be the $N \times N$ matrix whose first column is all ones for the grand mean and the other $N-1$ columns are

the contrasts of all the main effects and interactions of the full factorial design. The ith row of $\mathbf{H}$ is corresponding to the ith design point (run) in $\mathcal{H}$.

2.1 Estimation of the split-plot design

A split-plot design with n runs can be selected from the N rows of $\mathcal{H}$ without replacement by arranging the design points that have the same level combinations of the whole-plot factors into a whole plot. Assume that $\mathcal{D}$ is an n-run split-plot design with m_w whole-plot factors and $m_s = m - m_w$ subplot factors, where the total number of whole plots is b and the number of subplots in the ith whole plot is n_i, $i = 1, \cdots, b$. Let R be a requirement set containing p effects which usually includes all the main effects of whole-plot factors and subplot factors and some interactions. Then the linear model for R is

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}_1\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}$ is the $n \times 1$ vector of response, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1$ is the $(1+p) \times 1$ vector of the grand mean and the effects in R, $\mathbf{X}_1$ is the $n \times (1+p)$ matrix of the orthogonal contrasts for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1$, $\mathbf{Z}$ is an $n \times b$ indicator matrix with entries $z_{li} = 1$ if the lth run of $\mathcal{D}$ belongs to the ith whole-plot and $z_{li} = 0$ otherwise, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is the $b \times 1$ vector of random whole-plot errors, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is the $n \times 1$ vector of random subplot errors. It is assumed that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ are independent and have mean zero and variance-covariance matrix $\sigma_\gamma^2\mathbf{I}_b$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2\mathbf{I}_n$, respectively.

Since there exists a multistratum structure for the split-plot design, the variance-covariance matrix of $\mathbf{Y}$ is

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \sigma_\epsilon^2(\mathbf{I}_n + d\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'), \tag{2}$$

where $d = \sigma_\gamma^2/\sigma_\epsilon^2$. If the entries of $\mathbf{Y}$ are grouped per whole plots, then equation (2) can be written

as the $n \times n$ block diagonal matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_b \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i = \sigma_\epsilon^2(\mathbf{I}_{n_i} + d\mathbf{1}_{n_i}\mathbf{1}'_{n_i})$ for $i = 1, \cdots, b$. The generalized least square estimate (GLSE) of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1$ is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 = (\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1{}'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{Y},$$

and the variance-covariance matrix of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1$ is

$$cov(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1) = (\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}.$$

The estimates of σ_γ^2 and σ_ϵ^2 can be obtained by the restricted maximum likelihood (REML) method (see Letsinger et al., 1996).

2.2 General form of the D-optimal minimax criterion

Let $\mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{H}_1, \mathbf{H}_2)$, where $\mathbf{H}_1$ is the $N \times (p+1)$ submatrix of $\mathbf{H}$ with the column $\mathbf{1}_N$ for the grand mean and the columns for the p effects in the requirement set R, and $\mathbf{H}_2$ is the $N \times (N-p-1)$ submatrix of $\mathbf{H}$ with the columns for the effects not in R. Since the columns of $\mathbf{H}$ are orthogonal, it is obvious that

$$\mathbf{H}'\mathbf{H} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{V}_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where both $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{H}_1'\mathbf{H}_1$ and $\mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{H}_2'\mathbf{H}_2$ are diagonal matrices. If there exist significant effects that are not included in R, then model (1) is misspecified. The underlying true model with small

departures from (1) can be written as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}_1\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \mathbf{X}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 + \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_2$ is the $(N-p-1)\times 1$ vector of all the effects not in R and $\mathbf{X}_2$ is the $n\times(N-p-1)$ matrix of the orthogonal contrasts for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_2$. The unknown parameter vector is assumed satisfying $\frac{1}{N}\boldsymbol{\beta}_2'\mathbf{V}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \le \alpha^2$, where $\alpha \ge 0$ controls the seriousness of departures. Note that model (1) is correct if $\alpha = 0$.

When model (1) is misspecified ($\alpha > 0$), the generalized least square estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1$ is biased with

$$\begin{aligned} bias(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1) &= E(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 \\ &= (\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then the mean square error of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1$ is

$$\begin{aligned} MSE(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1, \mathbf{X}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2) &= cov(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1) + bias(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1)bias(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1)' \\ &= (\mathbf{X_1}'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X_1})^{-1} + (\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2'\mathbf{X}_2'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1(\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

A robust split-plot design should be able to simultaneously control the variances/covariances and the bias of the estimation. To construct and obtain the robust split-plot design for model misspecification, we adopt the D-optimal minimax criterion and provide a general form of the loss function which can be applied to searching for the optimal design with or without multistratum structure. Define the loss function of design $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to the requirement set R as

$$L_R(\mathcal{D}) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_2\in\Theta} |MSE(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1, \mathbf{X}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2)|, \tag{4}$$

where $\Theta = \{\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 | \frac{1}{N}\boldsymbol{\beta}_2'\mathbf{V}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \le \alpha^2\}$ and $|\cdot|$ is the determinant of a matrix. Let the singular value decomposition (SVD) of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ be $\mathbf{U}\Lambda\mathbf{U}'$ where $\mathbf{U}$ is an $n\times n$ unitary matrix and Λ is an $n\times n$ diagonal

matrix with non-negative eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. Define $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-2} = \mathbf{U}\Lambda^{-2}\mathbf{U}'$. Then Equation (4) can be written as

$$L_R(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1 + N\alpha^2\lambda_{max}\left(\mathbf{V}_1^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-2}\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)}{|\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1|}, \tag{5}$$

where $\lambda_{max}(\cdot)$ is the greatest eigenvalue of a matrix. The split-plot design that minimizes the loss function among all of the possible designs is call the D-optimal minimax split-plot designs, which is robust for model misspecification.

Equation (5) is a general form for the D-optimal minimax criterion which can be applied on both split-plot designs and completely randomized designs with or without model misspecification as follows.

I. When $d = 0$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ reduces to $\sigma_\epsilon^2\mathbf{I}_n$ and equation (5) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} L_R(\mathcal{D}) &= \frac{1+N\alpha^2\lambda_{max}(\sigma_\epsilon^{-2}\mathbf{I}_n - \sigma_\epsilon^{-2}\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}})}{\sigma_\epsilon^{-2(p+1)}|\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1|} \\ &= \sigma_\epsilon^{2(p+1)}\frac{1+\frac{N\alpha^2}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\left\{1-\lambda_{min}(\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}})\right\}}{|\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1|}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{min}(\cdot)$ is the smallest eigenvalue of a matrix. Therefore, equation (5) reduces to the form of the D-optimal minimax criterion given in Lin and Zhou (2013) for selecting the robust completely randomized design with model misspecification.

II. When $\alpha = 0$, equation (5) reduces to $L_R(\mathcal{D}) = 1/|\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1|$. Minimizing $L_R(\mathcal{D})$ is equivalent to maximizing $|\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1|^{1/(p+1)}$ and hence the D-optimal minimax criterion is equivalent to the D-optimal criterion for selecting the optimal split-plot design without model misspecification.

III. When both $d = 0$ and $\alpha = 0$, equation (5) reduces to $L_R(\mathcal{D}) = 1/|\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1|$. Minimizing $L_R(\mathcal{D})$ is equivalent to maximizing $|\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1|^{1/(p+1)}$ and hence the D-optimal minimax criterion

is equivalent to the D-optimal criterion for selecting the optimal completely randomized design without model misspecification.

2.3 Scale invariance

The D-optimal minimax criterion with the loss function as equation (5) is scale invariant. Suppose that contrasts of the effects are rescaled by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = \{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_2\} = \{\mathbf{H}_1\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{C}_2\},$$

where $\mathbf{C}_1 = diag(1, c_1, \cdots, c_p)$, $\mathbf{C}_2 = diag(c_{p+1}, \cdots, c_{N-1})$, and $c_1, \cdots, c_{N-1}$ are positive constants. Then $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_1 = \mathbf{C}_1\mathbf{V}_1\mathbf{C}_1$ and the fitted model with the rescaled effects can be written as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \mathbf{Z}\gamma + \epsilon, \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1 = \mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{C}_1$. Let $L_{R(\mathbf{X}_1)}(\mathcal{D})$ and $L_{R(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1)}(\mathcal{D})$ represent the loss functions of $\mathcal{D}$ corresponding to model (1) and model (6), respectively. Then we obtain

$$L_{R(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1)}(\mathcal{D}) = L_{R(\mathbf{X}_1)}(\mathcal{D}) / \prod_{i=1}^{p} c_i^2. \tag{7}$$

If $\mathcal{D}$ is a D-optimal minimax design for model (1), it minimizes $L_{R(\mathbf{X}_1)}(\mathcal{D})$. Thus $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1 = \mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{C}_1$ minimizes $L_{R(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1)}(\mathcal{D})$ and is a D-optimal minimax design for model (6). Therefore, the D-optimal minimax criterion is scale invariant.

3 Algorithm and update formulas

To construct and search for the robust split-plot design, we develop an efficient algorithm by combining the anneal algorithm and the point-exchange algorithm. The annealing algorithm has been

shown effective for constructing the D-optimal designs or D-optimal minimax completely randomized designs (see Fang and Wines, 2002; Haines, 1987; Meyer and Nachtsheim, 1988; Zhou, 2001, 2008, 2011) and the point-exchange algorithm is efficient for constructing optimal split-plot designs (see Goos and Vandebroek, 2001, 2003, 2004). Another important issue for constructing the robust split-plot design is that the computing is intensive to calculate the inverse and determinant of the updated designs. To save the computational cost, we apply and modify the update formulas suggested by Arnouts and Goos (2010).

3.1 Design construction algorithm

Let A be the candidate set of the whole plots, E be the candidate set of the subplots, T_0 be the initial temperature, a_b ($\leq b$) and e_{n_i} ($\leq n_i$), $i = 1, \cdots, b$, be the maximum numbers of whole plots and subplots that are allowed to change in a design to generate a new design, N_T be the number of designs searched at each temperature, and M_0 be the total number of temperature changes.

Step 1. Randomly generate an initial split-plot design $\mathcal{D}_0$ by selecting b whole plots $\mathbf{w}_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, b$, from the candidate set of whole plots A and selecting n_i subplot $\mathbf{t}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, n_i$, for the ith whole plot from the candidate set of subplots E. Make sure that the design point $(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij})$ for $i = 1, \cdots, b$, $j = 1, \cdots n_i$ are selected without replacement. Let J be the number of temperature changes in the algorithm and set $J = 1$ at beginning.

Step 2. Compute the loss function $L_R(\mathcal{D}_0)$. For each i, define a subset E_i including all the points in E that are not $\mathbf{t}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, n_i$.

Step 3. Implement point exchange for the whole plots.

(a) Randomly choose a number a from set $\{1, \cdots, a_b\}$. Select a whole plots $\mathbf{w}_{i_l}$, $l = 1, \cdots, a$, randomly and replace them by a design points selected randomly from A to obtain an updated design $\mathcal{D}^*$.

(b) Compute the loss function $L_R(\mathcal{D}^*)$. If $L_R(\mathcal{D}^*) < L_R(\mathcal{D}_0)$, then accept the updated design. Otherwise, accept the updated design $\mathcal{D}^*$ with probability $p_0 = exp\{-[L_R(\mathcal{D}^*) - L_R(\mathcal{D}_0)]/T_0\}$. If the updated design is accepted, then let $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{D}^*$.

Step 4. Conduct the point interchange for the whole plots.

(a) Swap design points between the ith whole plot and lth whole plot, where $i \neq l$, to obtain an updated design $\mathcal{D}^*$.

(b) Same as Step 3 (b).

Step 5. Perform the point exchange for the subplots.

(a) For the ith whole plot, $i = 1, \cdots, b$, randomly choose a number e from set $\{1, \cdots, e_{n_i}\}$. Select e subplot $\mathbf{t}_{ij_l}$, $l = 1, \cdots, e$, randomly and replace them by e design points selected randomly from E_i to obtain an updated design $\mathcal{D}^*$.

(b) Same as Step 3 (b).

Step 6. Repeat Step 2 to Step 5 N_T times and then go to Step 7.

Step 7. Reduce the temperature by a positive factor f (< 1), i.e., $T_0 = fT_0$, and set $J = J+1$. If $J \leq M_0$, then go to Step 2. Otherwise, finish the process.

The final design $\mathcal{D}_0$ obtained from the algorithm can be consider as the D-optimal minimax split-plot design.

3.2 Update formulas

If a matrix can be expressed in the form

$$\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{QDP},$$

then we can use the following formulas to calculate the determinant and the inverse of the matrix:

$$|\mathbf{M}+\mathbf{QDP}| = |\mathbf{M}||\mathbf{D}||\mathbf{D}^{-1}+\mathbf{PM}^{-1}\mathbf{Q}|, \tag{8}$$

and

$$(\mathbf{M}+\mathbf{QDP})^{-1} = \mathbf{M}^{-1} - \mathbf{M}^{-1}\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{D}^{-1}+\mathbf{PM}^{-1}\mathbf{Q})^{-1}\mathbf{PM}^{-1}. \tag{9}$$

The second formula is called the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula and the proofs of them were given by Harville (1997).

To apply the two formulas, let $\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_2 = \mathbf{G}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{G}_1$, and $\mathbf{M}_3 = \mathbf{G}_1'\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-2}\mathbf{G}_1$, where $\mathbf{G}_1 = \mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then equation (5) can be written as

$$L_R(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1+N\alpha^2\phi_R(\mathcal{D})}{\pi_R(\mathcal{D})}, \tag{10}$$

where $\phi_R(\mathcal{D}) = \lambda_{max}(\mathbf{M}_2^{-1}\mathbf{M}_3 - \mathbf{M}_2)$ and $\pi_R(\mathcal{D}) = |\mathbf{M}_1|$. Let $\mathbf{X}_{1i}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{1i}$ be the submatrices of $\mathbf{X}_1$ and $\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, respectively, corresponding to the ith whole plot. Let $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij})$ and $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij})$ be the rows of $\mathbf{X}_1$ and $\mathbf{X}_1\mathbf{V}_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, respectively, corresponding to the design point of the jth subplot in the ith whole plot. If the point exchange or interchange process of the algorithm updates $\mathbf{M}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_2$, $\mathbf{M}_3$ to $\mathbf{M}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_2^*$, $\mathbf{M}_3^*$, and a ane e are small, then formulas (8) and (9) are efficient for calculating the invariances and determinants of $\mathbf{M}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_2^*$, $\mathbf{M}_3^*$ for the updated design. We summarize the results of the update formulas for Step 3 to Step 5 in Table 1.

In Step 3, assume that the design point of whole-plot factors $\mathbf{w}_{i_l}$ is substituted by $\mathbf{w}_{i_l}^*$, $l = 1, \cdots, a$. This point exchange for whole-plot factors updates $\mathbf{X}_1$, $\mathbf{G}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_2$, and $\mathbf{M}_3$ to $\mathbf{X}_1^*$, $\mathbf{G}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_2^*$, and $\mathbf{M}_3^*$. Let $\mathbf{X}_{1i_l}^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_{1i_l}^*$ be the submatrices of $\mathbf{X}_1^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_1^*$, respectively, corresponding to the i_lth whole plot, $l = 1, \cdots, a$. Then equation (10) for the updated design in Step 3 can be calculated by replacing $|\mathbf{M}_1|$, $\mathbf{M}_2$, $\mathbf{M}_2^{-1}$, and $\mathbf{M}_3$ by $|\mathbf{M}_1^*|$, $\mathbf{M}_2^*$, $\mathbf{M}_2^{*-1}$, and $\mathbf{M}_3^*$, respectively, listed in Table 1 (a) where $\mathbf{P}_1$, $\mathbf{D}_1$, $\mathbf{P}_2$, and $\mathbf{D}_2$ are given in Table 1 (b).

Table 1: Update formulas for Step 3 to Step 5 of the algorithm

(a) Update formulas

$|\mathbf{M}_1^*| = |\mathbf{M}_1||\mathbf{D}_1||\mathbf{D}_1^{-1} + \mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{M}_1^{-1}\mathbf{P}_1'|$

$\mathbf{M}_2^* = \mathbf{M}_2 + \mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{D}_1\mathbf{P}_2'$

$\mathbf{M}_2^{*-1} = \mathbf{M}_2^{-1} - \mathbf{M}_2^{-1}\mathbf{P}_2'(\mathbf{D}_1^{-1} + \mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{M}_2^{-1}\mathbf{P}_2')^{-1}\mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{M}_2^{-1}$

$\mathbf{M}_3^* = \mathbf{M}_3 + \mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{D}_2\mathbf{P}_2'$

(b) Step 3. Exchange for whole plots

$\mathbf{P}_1 = (\mathbf{X}_{1i_1}', \cdots, \mathbf{X}_{1i_a}', \mathbf{X}_{1i_1}^{*'}, \cdots, \mathbf{X}_{1i_a}^{*'}, \mathbf{X}_{1i_1}'\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, \mathbf{X}_{1i_a}'\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_a}}, \mathbf{X}_{1i_1}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, \mathbf{X}_{1i_a}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_a}})'$

$\mathbf{D}_1 = \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} diag(-\mathbf{I}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, -\mathbf{I}_{n_{i_a}}, \mathbf{I}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, \mathbf{I}_{n_{i_a}}, \frac{d}{1+dn_{i_1}}, \cdots, \frac{d}{1+dn_{i_a}}, -\frac{d}{1+dn_{i_1}}, \cdots, -\frac{d}{1+dn_{i_a}})$

$\mathbf{P}_2 = (\mathbf{G}_{1i_1}', \cdots, \mathbf{G}_{1i_a}', \mathbf{G}_{1i_1}^{*'}, \cdots, \mathbf{G}_{1i_a}^{*'}, \mathbf{G}_{1i_1}'\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, \mathbf{G}_{1i_a}'\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_a}}, \mathbf{G}_{1i_1}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, \mathbf{G}_{1i_a}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_{i_a}})'$

$\mathbf{D}_2 = \sigma_\epsilon^{-4} diag(-\mathbf{I}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, -\mathbf{I}_{n_{i_a}}, \mathbf{I}_{n_{i_1}}, \cdots, \mathbf{I}_{n_{i_a}}, \frac{2d+d^2n_{i_1}}{(1+dn_{i_1})^2}, \cdots, \frac{2d+d^2n_{i_a}}{(1+dn_{i_a})^2}, -\frac{2d+d^2n_{i_1}}{(1+dn_{i_1})^2}, \cdots, -\frac{2d+d^2n_{i_a}}{(1+dn_{i_a})^2})$

(c) Step 4. Interchange for whole plots

$\mathbf{P}_1 = (\mathbf{X}_{1i}'\mathbf{1}_{n_i}, \mathbf{X}_{1l}'\mathbf{1}_{n_l}, \mathbf{X}_{1i}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_i}, \mathbf{X}_{1l}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_l})'$

$\mathbf{D}_1 = \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} diag(\frac{d}{1+dn_i}, \frac{d}{1+dn_l}, -\frac{d}{1+dn_i}, -\frac{d}{1+dn_l})$

$\mathbf{P}_2 = (\mathbf{G}_{1i}'\mathbf{1}_{n_i}, \mathbf{G}_{1l}'\mathbf{1}_{n_l}, \mathbf{G}_{1i}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_i}, \mathbf{G}_{1l}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_l})'$

$\mathbf{D}_2 = \sigma_\epsilon^{-4} diag(\frac{2d+d^2n_i}{(1+dn_i)^2}, \frac{2d+d^2n_l}{(1+dn_l)^2}, -\frac{2d+d^2n_i}{(1+dn_i)^2}, -\frac{2d+d^2n_l}{(1+dn_l)^2})$

(d) Step 5. Exchange for subplots

$\mathbf{P}_1 = (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_1}), \cdots, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_e}), \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_1}^*), \cdots, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_1}^*), \mathbf{X}_{1i}'\mathbf{1}_{n_i}, \mathbf{X}_{1i}^{*'}\mathbf{1}_{n_i})'$

$\mathbf{D}_1 = \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} diag(-1, \cdots, -1, 1, \cdots, 1, \frac{d}{1+dn_i}, -\frac{d}{1+dn_i})$

$\mathbf{P}_2 = (\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_1}), \cdots, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_e}), \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_1}^*), \cdots, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}_{ij_e}^*), \mathbf{G}_{1i}'\mathbf{1}_{n_i}, \mathbf{G}_{1i}'\mathbf{1}_{n_i})'$

$\mathbf{D}_2 = \sigma_\epsilon^{-4} diag(-1, \cdots, -1, 1, \cdots, 1, \frac{2d+d^2n_i}{(1+dn_i)^2}, -\frac{2d+d^2n_i}{(1+dn_i)^2})$

In Step 4, assume that the design points of whole-plot factors $\mathbf{w}_i$ and $\mathbf{w}_l$ are interchanged. This point interchange for whole-plot factors updates $\mathbf{X}_1$, $\mathbf{G}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_2$, and $\mathbf{M}_3$ to $\mathbf{X}_1^*$, $\mathbf{G}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_2^*$, and $\mathbf{M}_3^*$. Let $\mathbf{X}_{1i}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{1l}$ ($\mathbf{G}_{1i}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{1l}$) be the submatrices of $\mathbf{X}_1$ ($\mathbf{G}_1$) corresponding to the ith and lth whole plots, respectively, and $\mathbf{X}_{1i}^*$ and $\mathbf{X}_{1l}^*$ ($\mathbf{G}_{1i}^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_{1l}^*$) be the submatrices of $\mathbf{X}_1^*$ ($\mathbf{G}_1^*$) corresponding to the ith and lth whole plots, respectively. Then equation (10) for the updated design in Step 4 can be calculated by replacing $|\mathbf{M}_1|$, $\mathbf{M}_2$, $\mathbf{M}_2^{-1}$, and $\mathbf{M}_3$ by $|\mathbf{M}_1^*|$, $\mathbf{M}_2^*$, $\mathbf{M}_2^{*-1}$, and $\mathbf{M}_3^*$, respectively, listed in Table 1 (a) where $\mathbf{P}_1$, $\mathbf{D}_1$, $\mathbf{P}_2$, and $\mathbf{D}_2$ are given in Table 1 (c).

In Step 5, assume that the design point of subplot factors $\mathbf{t}_{ij_l}$ is substituted by $\mathbf{t}_{ij_l}^*$, $l = 1, \cdots, e$. This point exchange for subplot factors updates $\mathbf{X}_1$, $\mathbf{G}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_1$, $\mathbf{M}_2$, and $\mathbf{M}_3$ to $\mathbf{X}_1^*$, $\mathbf{G}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_1^*$, $\mathbf{M}_2^*$, and $\mathbf{M}_3^*$. Let $\mathbf{X}_{1i_l}^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_{1i_l}^*$ be the submatrices of $\mathbf{X}_1^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_1^*$, respectively, corresponding to the ith

whole plot and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}^*_{ij_l})$ and $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{t}^*_{ij_l})$ be the rows of $\mathbf{X}^*_1$ and $\mathbf{G}^*_1$, respectively, corresponding to the j_lth design point in the ith whole plot, $l = 1, \cdots, e$. Then equation (10) for the updated design in Step 5 can be calculated by replacing $|\mathbf{M}_1|$, $\mathbf{M}_2$, $\mathbf{M}_2^{-1}$, and $\mathbf{M}_3$ by $|\mathbf{M}^*_1|$, $\mathbf{M}^*_2$, $\mathbf{M}^{*-1}_2$, and $\mathbf{M}^*_3$, respectively, listed in Table 1 (a) where $\mathbf{P}_1$, $\mathbf{D}_1$, $\mathbf{P}_2$, and $\mathbf{D}_2$ are given in Table 1 (d).

4 Examples

We apply the construction algorithm developed in Section 3.1 and use the general form of the loss function for D-optimal minimax criterion introduced in Section 2.2 to obtain the robust split-plot designs for model misspecification. Two examples are given to demonstrate our methods. The first example is for two-level split-plot designs and the second example is for mixed-level split-plot designs.

Example 1. Consider to construct a split-plot design with fifteen runs and five two-level factors $F_1, \cdots, F_5$, where the two levels of factors are coded as $(-1, +1)$. Suppose that the first two factors F_1 and F_2 are hard-to-change factors arranged into four whole plots ($b = 4$) and the last three factors F_3, F_4, F_5 are easy-to-change factors where the numbers of subplots in the ith whole plot are $n_i = 4$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $n_i = 3$ for $i = 4$. If we want to investigate all the main effects, the interaction of F_1 and F_2, and the interaction of F_1 and F_3, then the requirement set is $R = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_1x_2, x_1x_3\}$, where x_i is the main effect of F_i, $i = 1, \cdots, 5$. The number of effects in the requirement set R is $p = 7$ and N in this case is $2^5 = 32$. Let the candidate set of whole plots A be the 2^2 full factorial design and the candidate set of subplots E be the 2^3 full factorial design. We apply the algorithm by setting $T_0 = .001$, $M_0 = 50$, $N_T = 100$, $a_b = 3$, $e_{n_i} = 3$, and $f = .8$ to search for the D-optimal minimax split-plot design ($\alpha = 1$) and the D-optimal split-plot design ($\alpha = 0$) with $\sigma_\epsilon = 1$ and $\sigma_\gamma = 1$. The update formulas given in Table 1 are used for increasing the computing speed for obtaining the loss function of the updated designs, $L_R(\mathcal{D}^*)$. Table 2 lists two optimal split-plot designs. The $(1+p)$th root of the determinant of the information

Table 2: D-optimal split-plot design ($\mathcal{D}_1$ with $\alpha = 0$) and D-optimal minimax split-plot design ($\mathcal{D}_2$ with $\alpha = 1$) for $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = \sigma_\gamma^2 = 1$.

Design $\mathcal{D}_1$

WP	F_1	F_2	F_3	F_4	F_5
1	1	−1	1	1	1
	1	−1	−1	−1	−1
	1	−1	−1	−1	1
	1	−1	1	1	−1
2	−1	1	1	1	−1
	−1	1	1	−1	−1
	−1	1	−1	1	1
	−1	1	−1	−1	1
3	−1	−1	−1	−1	−1
	−1	−1	1	−1	1
	−1	−1	−1	1	−1
	−1	−1	1	1	1
4	1	1	1	−1	−1
	1	1	−1	1	1
	1	1	−1	1	−1

$\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_1) = .6733$
$\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_1)^{1/(1+p)} = 6.7468$
$L_R(\mathcal{D}_1)^{1/(1+p)} = .2188$

Design $\mathcal{D}_2$

WP	F_1	F_2	F_3	F_4	F_5
1	1	1	−1	1	1
	1	1	1	−1	−1
	1	1	1	1	−1
	1	1	−1	−1	1
2	−1	−1	−1	−1	1
	−1	−1	1	−1	−1
	−1	−1	1	1	1
	−1	−1	−1	1	−1
3	1	−1	−1	−1	−1
	1	−1	1	−1	1
	1	−1	−1	1	−1
	1	−1	1	1	1
4	−1	1	−1	−1	1
	−1	1	1	1	−1
	−1	1	−1	1	−1

$\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_2) = .6323$
$\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_2)^{1/(1+p)} = 6.7339$
$L_R(\mathcal{D}_2)^{1/(1+p)} = .2176$

matrix of $\mathcal{D}_1$ with respect to the requirement set R is $\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_1)^{1/(1+p)} = 6.7468$. Since $\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_1)^{1/(1+p)}$ is minimum among all of the designs we construct, $\mathcal{D}_1$ is the D-optimal split-plot design. However, if the fitted model is misspecified and there exist small departures from the underlying true model with $\alpha = 1$, then the $(1 + p)$th root of the loss function of $\mathcal{D}_1$ is $L_R(\mathcal{D}_1)^{1/(1+p)} = .2188$, which is greater than $L_R(\mathcal{D}_2)^{1/(1+p)} = .2176$. It implies that design $\mathcal{D}_1$ has higher bias of the estimation than design $\mathcal{D}_2$. Since $L_R(\mathcal{D}_2)^{1/(1+p)}$ is minimum among all of the designs we construct, $\mathcal{D}_2$ is the D-optimal minimax split-plot design. Therefore, when $\alpha = 1$, design $\mathcal{D}_2$ is the optimally robust split-plot design for model misspecification. We look into the allocations of the design points in $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ and show their structures in Figure 1. We find that, in each whole plot with $n_i = 4$ in $\mathcal{D}_1$, the connection of two points of the subplots can be parallel to the connection of the other two



(a) Design $\mathcal{D}_1$ (b) Design $\mathcal{D}_2$

Figure 1: Structures of $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$

points. However, for the whole plot $(-1,-1)$ in $\mathcal{D}_2$, it is impossible to connect two points which is parallel to the connection of the other two points. The different structures between the two designs result in less bias of the estimation for design $\mathcal{D}_2$ when the model is misspecified with $\alpha = 1$.

Example 2. Consider an experiment with factors F_1, F_2, and F_3, where F_1 has two levels and F_2 and F_3 have three levels. Assume that F_1 is a hard-to-change factor arranged into four whole plots. The other two factors F_2 and F_3 are easy to change and the numbers of subplots in the ith whole plot are $n_i = 2$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $n_i = 3$ for $i = 3, 4$. If we are interested in estimating all the main effects, the interaction between F_1 and F_2, and the interaction between F_1 and F_3, then the requirement set is $R = \{x_1, x_{2L}, x_{2Q}, x_{3L}, x_{3Q}, x_1x_{2L}, x_1x_{2Q}, x_1x_{3L}, x_1x_{3Q}\}$, where x_1 is the main effect of F_1 and x_{iL} and x_{iQ} are the linear and quadratic components of the main effect of factor F_i, $i = 2, 3$. The two levels of F_1 are coded as $(-1, +1)$ and the three levels $(0, 1, 2)$ of F_i are coded as $\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}(-1, 0, +1)$ for x_{iL} and $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}(+1, -2, +1)$ for x_{iQ}, $i = 2, 3$. The candidate set of the whole plots A is the 2^1 full factorial design and the candidate set of the subplots E is the 3^2 full factorial design. We apply the algorithm by setting $T_0 = .001$, $M_0 = 50$, $N_T = 100$, $a_b = 3$, $e_{n_i} = 2$, and $f = .8$ to construct the D-optimal minimax split-plot design with $\sigma^2_\epsilon = 1$, $\sigma^2_\gamma = 1$, and $\alpha = 1$. Table

Table 3: Designs $\mathcal{D}_3$ and $\mathcal{D}_4$ in Example 2.

Design $\mathcal{D}_3$			
WP	F_1	F_2	F_3
1	-1	0	0
	-1	1	1
2	1	0	2
	1	0	1
3	-1	2	2
	-1	2	0
	-1	0	1
4	1	2	1
	1	1	2
	1	1	0
$\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_3) = .9074$			
$\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_3)^{1/(1+p)} = 4.5472$			
$L_R(\mathcal{D}_3)^{1/(1+p)} = .2925$			

Design $\mathcal{D}_4$			
WP	F_1	F_2	F_3
1	-1	2	2
	-1	1	1
2	1	2	0
	1	0	2
3	-1	1	0
	-1	0	2
	-1	2	1
4	1	2	1
	1	0	0
	1	1	2
$\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_4) = .6667$			
$\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_4)^{1/(1+p)} = 4.5472$			
$L_R(\mathcal{D}_4)^{1/(1+p)} = .2842$			

2 lists two designs $\mathcal{D}_3$ and $\mathcal{D}_4$. Both $\mathcal{D}_3$ and $\mathcal{D}_4$ have the same $(1+p)$th root of the determinants of the information matrices, $\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_3)^{1/(1+p)} = \pi_R(\mathcal{D}_4)^{1/(1+p)} = 4.5472$. Since $\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_3)^{1/(1+p)}$ and $\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_4)^{1/(1+p)}$ are maximum among all of the designs, both $\mathcal{D}_3$ and $\mathcal{D}_4$ are D-optimal split-plot designs. However, if model is misspecified with $\alpha = 1$, then design $\mathcal{D}_3$ has $\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_3) = 0.9074$ and $\mathcal{D}_4$ has $\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_4) = 0.6667$. The value of $\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_4)$ is minimum among all of the designs. Therefore, $\mathcal{D}_4$ is the D-optimal minimax split-plot design. Since $\pi_R(\mathcal{D}_4)^{1/(1+p)}$ is maximum and $\phi_R(\mathcal{D}_4)$ is minimum, the value of $L_R(\mathcal{D}_4)$ does not depend on α and is minimum among all of the designs. Therefor, $\mathcal{D}_4$ is the optimally robust split-plot design with or without model misspecification. This example shows that the D-optimal minimax split-plot design could be also the D-optimal split-plot design.

5 Conclusions and remarks

Many approaches for constructing optimal split-plot designs could be found in literature. However, the optimal designs obtained by these methods might be unrobust for model misspecification. If

there exist significant effects that are not included in the model, then the estimation of effects could be highly biased. In this paper, we take the model misspecification into account. We extend the application of the D-optimal minimax criterion to the split-plot design and provide a general form of the loss function for the criterion. This general form of the loss function can be used for finding the optimal design for split-plot experiments and complete randomized experiments with or without model misspecification. By combining the anneal algorithm and the point-exchange algorithm, we develop a new construction algorithm to efficiently obtain the robust split-plot design for model misspecification.

There exist two articles that are related to our work. The first article by Smucker et al. (2012) provides a method to obtain the model-robust designs for split-plot experiments. The authors argued that many methods in literature rely on the a priori assumption that the form of the regression function is known. They relaxed this assumption by allowing a set of model forms to be specified. This method uses a scaled product of D-optimal criterion to produce designs that account for all models in the set. This method is innovative and the optimal split-plot design constructed by it is robust if the specified set of model forms includes the true model. However, in practice the underlying true model is usually complicated and unknown. It is not easy to specify a set that including the unknown true model. In this paper, we relax this constraint for the specified set. Our method dose not rely on the knowledge of the true model and allows the fitted model differing from the unknown true model. By minimizing the loss function, the optimal split-plot design obtained by our method can simultaneously control the variances/covariances and the bias of the estimation and hence is robust for model misspecification.

Another article by Mann et al. (2014) is close to our work. Both of their method and our method use the D-optimal minimax criterion but with different model setting. The method proposed by Mann et al. (2014) assumed that the block effects are fixed while our method assumes that the block effects are random. The former is usually used for finding the robust block design with model misspecification and the later is used for obtaining the robust split-plot design.

In summary, a good split-plot design should be able to control both the variances/covariances and the bias of the estimation. The method we propose can achieve this goal and construct the robust split-plot design for model misspecification.

References

Arnouts, H. and Goos, P. (2010). "Update formulas for split-plot and block designs". *Computational statistics and data analysis* 54, pp. 3381-3391.

Bingham, D. and Sitter, R. R. (1999a). "Minimum-Aberration Two-Level Fractional Factorial Split-Plot Designs". *Technometrics* 29, pp. 62-70.

Bingham, D. and Sitter, R. R. (1999b). "Some Theoretical Results for Fractional Factorial Split-Plot Designs". *The Annals of Statistics* 27, pp. 1240-1255.

Bingham, D. and Sitter, R. R. (2001). "Design Issues in Fractional Factorial Split-Plot Experiments". *Journal of Quality Technology* 33, pp. 2-15.

Bingham, D. and Sitter, R. R. (2003). "Fractional Factorial Split-Plot Designs for Robust Parameter Experiments". *Technometrics* 45, pp. 80-89.

Fang, Z. and Wiens, D. P. (2000). "Integer-valued, minimax robust designs for estimation and extrapolation in heteroscedastic, approximately linear models". *Journal of the American statistical association* 95, pp. 807-818.

Fisher, R. A. (1925). *Statistical Methods for Research Workers.* Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

Goos, P. and Vandebroek, M. (2001). "Optimal Split-Plot Designs". *Journal of Quality Technology* 33, pp. 436-450.

Goos, P. and Vandebroek, M. (2003). "D-Optimal Split-Plot Designs with Given Numbers and Sizes of Whole Plots". *Technometrics* 45, pp. 235-245.

Goos, P. and Vandebroek, M. (2004). "Outperforming Completely Randomized Designs". *Journal of Quality Technology* 36, pp. 12-26.

Haines, L. M. (1987). "The application of the annealing algorithm to the construction of the exact optimal designs for linear regression models". *Technometrics* 29, pp. 439-447.

Harville, D. A. (1997). "Matrix algebra from a statistician's perspective". *Springer-Verlag* Telos.

Huang, P.; Dechang, C.; and Voelkel, J. O. (1998). "Minimum-Aberration Two-Level Split-Plot Designs". *Technometrics* 40, pp. 314-326.

Jones, B. and Goos, P. (2007). "A candidate-set-free algorithm for generating D-optimal split-plot designs". *Journal of the royal statistical society. series C, Applied statistics* 56, pp. 347-364.

Jones, B. and Nachtsheim, C. J. (2009). "Split-Plot Designs: What, Why, and How". *Journal of Quality Technology* 41, pp. 340-361.

Letsinger, J. D.; Mayers, R. H.; and Lentner, M. (1996). "Response Surface Methods for Bi-Randomization Structures". *Journal of Quality Technology* 28, pp. 381-397.

Lin, D. K. J. and Zhou, J. (2013). "D-optimal minimax fractional factorial designs". *The Canadian journal of statistics* 41, pp. 325-340.

Mann, R. K.; Edwards, R.; and Zhou J. (2015). "Robust designs for experiments with blocks". *Communications in statistics - theory and methods*. In press.

Mukerjee, R. and Fang, K.-T. (2002). "Fractional Factorial Split-Plot Designs with Minimum Aberration and Maximum Estimation Capacity". *Statistica Sinica* 12, pp. 885-903.

Mayer, R. K. and Nachtsheim, C. J. (1988). "Constructing exact D-optimal experimental designs by simulated annealing". *American journal of mathematical and management sciences* 8, pp. 329-359.

Smucker, B. J.; Castillo, E. d.; and Rosenberger J. L. (2012). "Model-robust designs for split-plot experiments". *Computational statistics and data analysis* 56, pp. 4111-4121.

Tichon, J. G.; Li, W.; and Mcleod, R. G. (2012). "Generalized Minimum Aberration Two-Level Split-Plot Designs". *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 142, pp. 1407-1414.

Wilmut, M. and Zhou, J. (2011). "D-optimal minimax design criterion for two-level fractional factorial designs". *Journal of statistical planning and inference* 141, pp. 576-587.

Yin, Y. and Zhou, J. (2014). "Minimax design criterion for fractional factorial designs". *Annals of the institute of statistical mathematics*. DOI:10.1007/s10463-041-0470-0.

Zhou, J. (2001). "Integer-valued, minimax robust designs for approximately linear models with correlated errors". *Communications in statistics: theory and methods* 30, pp. 21-39.

Zhou, J. (2008). "D-optimal minimax regression designs on discrete design space". *Journal of statistical planning and inference* 138, pp. 4081-4092.